Serial No. 10/581,072 Response to Office Action of July 10, 2008 Page 9

Remarks:

Applicants notes with appreciation that previous rejections have been withdrawn and that claims 1-15 are considered free of the prior art and allowable. Claim 16, however, is rejected as both anticipated by and obvious over Zagar et al., WO2003/024221.

Claim 16 has been amended herein by rewriting as new claim 17. This new claim is dependent on claim 1 and discloses a further step wherein a compound of Formula I where R¹ is hydrogen is reacted with an alkylating agent as recited in the former claim 16. Applicant submits that this claim is both novel and nonobvious over the cited Zagar reference because the new claim now explicitly incorporates the features of allowable claim 1, and because Zagar, as the Office concedes, does not teach, suggest or guide a skilled reader to all features of the new claim. Zagar does not contain the slightest hint, let alone a concrete disclosure of preparation of NH-uracils according to claim 1 of the present application. Thus Zagar does not anticipate the new claim 17 and does not point to or motivate a skilled reader to this claim so as to render the claim obvious.

Applicant therefore submits that the rejections of claim 16 on both grounds of anticipation and obviousness are overcome. Applicant requests reconsideration of the application and allowance of claims 1-15 and 17 presented here.

Respectfully submitted,

By:

Martha Cassidy

Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 44,066

ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, p.c.

Suite 800, 1425 K Street, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20005 Telephone: (202)783-6040

1531125